

X

$$\vdots$$

•

•
•
•

•

•

•

•

•

:

X

1


any objections to the R&R within ten days from the service of the Report and that failure to file a timely objection generally waives further judicial review.

By letter dated May 8, 2008, plaintiff advised Judge Bloom of his medical ailments, noted that he could not find a job, and stated that he “need[ed] help and more time to file confirmations or objections.” See Plaintiff’s Letter dated 5/13/08 (Dkt. No. 21). Judge Bloom construed the letter as a request for an extension of time to file objections to the R&R, and granted an extension to May 30, 2008, but admonished plaintiff that no further extensions would be permitted. Notwithstanding, Judge Bloom’s admonition, plaintiff wrote this court by letter dated May 28, 2008, seeking a further extension of time to file his objections. This court granted the request to June 20, 2008, but advised plaintiff that, should he fail timely to file his objections, the letters he had already submitted to the court would be construed as his objections. See Dkt. No. 23. No further communications have been received from plaintiff. Accordingly, the court construes plaintiff’s letters of May 13 and May 28, 2008, as his objections to Judge Bloom’s Report and Recommendation.

The substance of plaintiff’s objections is that he was tricked into signing the stipulation of settlement in this case. See Letter dated 5/13/08 at 3. He does not allege that defendants failed to meet their obligations under the agreement. Rather, he complains that he now wishes to apply for re-employment by defendant, in contravention of the terms of the settlement agreement. Because, as Judge Bloom concluded, plaintiff’s conclusory allegation that he was defrauded into settling the case is flatly belied by the record, see R&R at 3-4, citing Tran. at 2, 6-7 (Dkt. No. 17), the court finds no merit in plaintiff’s objections.

Accordingly, having conducted a de novo review of the record, the court adopts the Report and Recommendation, Dkt. No. 20, as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and denies plaintiff's motion to vacate the settlement.

SO ORDERED.

/S/

Allyne R. Ross
United States District Judge

Dated: July 3, 2008
Brooklyn, New York

SERVICE LIST:

Plaintiff Pro Se

Julius McIntyre
889 Putnam Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11221

Defendants' Attorney

Robert Kenneth Drinan
NYC Transit Authority
130 Livingston Street, 12th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201

cc: Magistrate Judge Bloom